

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION

Darrell Snow,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil Action No. 1:14-412-TMC-SVH
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
State of South Carolina; County of)	
Georgetown; Georgetown County)	
Detention Center; Joann Clarey,)	
Position Lt.; Michael A. Schwartz,)	
Position Administrator; and Collette)	
Wineglass, Position Captain,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The plaintiff, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, DSC, this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Before the court is the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation ("Report"), recommending that the court dismiss the plaintiff's amended complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process as to all defendants, except Joann Clarey. (ECF No. 12.) Although advised of his right to do so, the plaintiff has not objected to the Report and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to

accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party’s waiver of the right to appeal the district court’s judgment based upon that recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, the following defendants are DISMISSED without prejudice and without issuance and service of process: State of South Carolina, County of Georgetown, Georgetown County Detention Center, Michael A. Schwartz, and Collette Wineglass.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

May 6, 2014
Anderson, South Carolina